(1)

(3) 4

BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR Single Bench

M.C.C. NO. 112 OF 2006.

APPLICANTS :- 1. Raipur Development Authority,
Through : its Chief Executive Officer,
Raipur (Chhattisgarh),

RESPONDENT NO. 2 & 3

2. Chief Executive Officer,
Raipur Development Authority,
District - Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

V E R S U S

NON-APPLICANTS :- 1. Surendra Kumar Arora, aged about 42 years, son of Jeevandalmal Kakkad, resident of A-20, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Distt. Raipur (Chhattisgarh),

PETITIONER

2. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Revenue Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (Chhattisgarh),
3. Tahsildar, Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh),
4. N.M.D.C. Employees Cooperative Housing Society Ltd., Through its Secretary, Civil Lines, Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

RESPONDENT NO. 1, 4 AND 5

P.R. No. 629/06
Presented by Shri J. K. Gupta
dated 7/3/06
July 7/3/06
4:50

RECEIVED-COPY
D. Rajak 7/3/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

NOTARY
Ph.222374
Feroze Hussain
NOTARY(ADVOCATE)
RAIPUR DISTRICT
RAIPUR.(M.P.)INDIA
REGD: M.P.-27
13-3-98
GOVT. OF CHHATTISGARH.

APPLICATION FOR EXTENTION OF TIME.

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक M.C.C. 112 **सन् 2006**

19

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	13-9-2006 Mr. H.B. Agrawal, Senior Advocate with Mr. Pankaj Agrawal, Advocate for the applicants. Mr. Vaibhav A. Goverdhan, counsel for non-applicant No.1. Heard both the counsel. This application has been filed for extension of time to decide the representation made by non-applicant No.1 herein. Vide order dated 9-11-2005, the applicants herein were directed to decide the representation of non-applicant No.1 herein within a period of three months from that day. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that due to strikes of Patwaris demarcation could not be made and ultimately, the demarcation was made on 18-5-2006, but unfortunately, even after 18-5-2006 about four months have elapsed, even then, no order has been passed on the representation of non-applicant No.1. Accordingly, no justification for extension of time has been given by the applicants. The application (M.C.C. No.112/2006) is rejected. **Sd/-** **L.C. Bhadoo** **Judge**	

Soma